



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/849,093	05/04/2001	Praerit Garg	MSFT-0222/158379.2	9404
41505 7590 11/21/2007 WOODCOCK WASHBURN LLP (MICROSOFT CORPORATION) CIRA CENTRE, 12TH FLOOR 2929 ARCH STREET PHILADELPHIA, PA 19104-2891			EXAMINER DINH, MINH	
			ART UNIT 2132	PAPER NUMBER
			MAIL DATE 11/21/2007	DELIVERY MODE PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

mn

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/849,093	GARG ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Minh Dinh	2132	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 14 September 2007.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-4, 7-10, 12-14, 18-22, 24-28, 33 and 34 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-4, 7-10, 12-14, 18-22, 24-28, 33 and 34 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 04 May 2001 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Amendment

1. This action is in response to the RCE/amendment filed 09/14/07.
Claims 1, 9-10, 12-14, 18-22, 24-28 and 33-34 have been amended; claims 5-6, 15-17, 23 and 29 have been cancelled.

Response to Arguments

2. Applicant's arguments, see the first paragraph of page 9, with respect to the rejection(s) of claims 33-34 under 35 USC 112, 1st paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement, have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. Claim 33 recites the limitation "the registered dynamic access check callback function is invoked such that the client context is augmented with client contextual data dynamically computed using said dynamic data." However, the part of the specification cited by the Applicant discloses that it is the registered Compute Dynamic Group callback function that performs client context augmentation (last sentence of page 11).

3. Applicant's arguments with respect to the rejection(s) of claims 1-10 and 12-29 under 35 USC 102(e) as being anticipated by Swift (6,308,274) have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Applicant argues that Swift does not disclose dynamic data includes authorization policy data stored in a callback access control entry and/or run-time data managed by the application. Swift discloses utilizing a restricted SID (fig. 9; col. 12, line 60 – col. 13, line 15). This restricted SID is: (i) dynamic data, i.e., it is part of the restricted token, which is dynamically generated; and (ii) run-time data managed by the application, i.e., the restricted token is run-time data managed by the game application.

Applicant argues that Swift does not disclose a dynamic policy is tailored to an application through which the resource is accessed (page 10, 1st paragraph). Swift discloses utilizing a dynamic policy tailored to an application through which the resource is accessed, i.e., an access control entry indicating whether a game application is allowed to access a resource (fig. 9; col. 12, line 60 – col. 13, line 15).

Applicant argues that Swift does not disclose automatically invoke an application-defined dynamic access check routine based on such dynamic data and policy (page 10, last paragraph). Swift discloses that when access to a resource is granted based on a normal SID (a user SID or group SID), an application-defined dynamic access check routine based on such dynamic data (i.e., the restricted SID) and policy is invoked (fig. 6, step 100; fig. 7, step 708).

Applicant argues that Swift further fails to teach that the dynamic data is used to enable the application to assign temporary group membership, based on dynamic factors, to a client for the purpose of checking access rights as claimed in claim 26. Swift discloses that, at run time, a restricted access token having temporary group membership is created using the type of application used by the user to access a resource (fig. 2, element 84; col. 6, lines 4-28; col. 12, lines 46-67). The application type is run-time data (i.e., evaluated at run time) managed by the application (i.e., part of the application).

Claim Objections

4. Claims 1-4, 7-10, 12-14, 12-22 and 24-25 are objected to because of the following informalities: "a callback access control entry" (claim 1, line 16; claims 12 and 22, last line) should be changed to "said callback access control entry". Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

5. The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

6. Claims 26-28 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention. Claim 26 recites the limitation "wherein **said dynamic groups element** and a dynamic access element **utilize dynamic data that includes authorization policy data stored in a callback access control entry** and/or run-time data managed by the application." (lines 8-9). The originally filed specification does not disclose that Dynamic Groups utilize data in a callback access control entry. Therefore, the limitation is considered new matter. Claims that are not specifically addressed are rejected by virtue of their dependency.

7. Claims 33-34 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention. Claim 33 recites the limitation "automatically invoking a dynamic access check callback function by access check application

programming interfaces that initialize a client authorization context from a system level authorization context or a user's security identifier, whereby when a user attempts to connect to the application, the registered dynamic access check callback function is invoked such that the client context is augmented with client contextual data dynamically computed using said dynamic data." The originally filed specification does not disclose using/invoking a dynamic access check callback function to (i) initialize a client authorization context from a system level authorization context or a user's security identifier, or (ii) augment the client context with client contextual data dynamically computed using said dynamic data. Therefore, the limitation is considered new matter. Claims that are not specifically addressed are rejected by virtue of their dependency.

8. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

9. Claims 1-4, 7-10, 12-14, 18-22 and 24-25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being incomplete for omitting essential steps, such omission amounting to a gap between the steps. See MPEP § 2172.01.

- Regarding claim 1, the omitted steps are: initializing/computing client authorization context (fig. 5A, step 520); updating said authorization context according to said determining (fig. 5A, step 540); comparing the client authorization context of the client to at least one access control entry of an access control list (fig. 5A, step 550).
- Regarding claim 12, the omitted steps are: comparing the client authorization context of the client to at least one access control entry of an access control list (fig. 5A, step 550); identifying an access control entry as a callback access control entry (Specification, page 12, lines 6-11).
- Regarding claim 22, the omitted steps are: initializing/computing client authorization context (fig. 5A, step 520); determining, via an application programming interface, based upon dynamic data and first dynamic policy whether a client authorization context is to be updated, wherein said first dynamic policy is tailored to an application through which the resource is accessed (fig. 5A, step 530); updating said authorization context according to said determining (fig. 5A, step 540).

Claims that are not specifically addressed are rejected by virtue of their dependency.

10. Claims 1-4, 7-10, 12-14 and 18-21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and

distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Regarding claim 1, it recites "said dynamic data" (lines 15-16); however, there are two instances of "dynamic data" (line 4 and 14). It's not clear which instance of "dynamic data" is referred to. Claim 12 is rejected on the same basis as claim 1. Claims that are not specifically addressed are rejected by virtue of their dependency.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

11. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

12. Claims 1-4, 7-10, 12-14, 18-22 and 24-28 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Swift (6,308,274).

The applied reference has a common assignee with the instant application. Based upon the earlier effective U.S. filing date of the reference, it constitutes prior art under 35 U.S.C. 102(e). This rejection

under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) might be overcome either by a showing under 37 CFR 1.132 that any invention disclosed but not claimed in the reference was derived from the inventor of this application and is thus not the invention "by another," or by an appropriate showing under 37 CFR 1.131.

Regarding claims 1, 3-4, 10, 12-14, 22 and 24, Swift discloses a method for dynamically managing access to a resource in a computer system having a client making a request for the resource, the method comprising:

- computing a client authorization context after the request for the resource is received from the client (col. 4, lines 46-55);

- determining, via an application programming interface, based upon dynamic data and first dynamic policy whether the client authorization context is to be updated, wherein said first dynamic policy is tailored to an application through which the resource is accessed (col. 6, line 5 – col. 7, line 35);

- updating the client authorization context according to said determination (col. 6, line 5 – col. 7, line 35);

- comparing the client authorization context to at least one access control entry of an access control list (col. 7, lines 51-61);

- identifying an access control entry as a callback access control entry, i.e., an access control entry of type allow (col. 5, lines 2-11); and

in response to identifying the access control entry as a callback access control entry and a match between an identifier in the client authorization context and an identifier in the callback access control entry, automatically invoking, via said application programming interface, an application-defined dynamic access check routine that performs based upon dynamic data and second dynamic policy in the callback access control entry for the application, wherein said second dynamic policy is tailored to said application and said dynamic data includes run-time data managed by the application, i.e., the restricted SID (fig. 9; col. 7, lines 51-61; col. 11, lines 21-65; col. 12, line 60 – col. 13, line 15).

Regarding claim 2, Swift further discloses that the first dynamic policy defines flexible rules for determining the client authorization context (col. 6, lines 5-27; col. 12, lines 16-45) and wherein said second dynamic policy defines flexible rules for purposes of determining access privileges (col. 7, lines 51-61; col. 11, lines 21-65).

Regarding claims 7 and 18, Swift further discloses registering with the operating system, which is the resource manager of the computer system, an application-defined routine for determining dynamic groups (col. 6, lines 38-47; col. 12, lines 36-67).

Regarding claims 8 and 19, Swift further discloses an application-defined routine for determining dynamic access checks is performed by the

security mechanism in the kernel (col. 11, lines 10-20). Inherently, the routine is registered with the operating system, which is the resource manager of the computer system.

Regarding claims 9, 21 and 25, Swift further discloses that the application-defined dynamic access check routine supplements a determination of access rights based upon static data and policy (col. 11, lines 38-56).

Regarding claim 20, Swift further discloses comparing data to a client authorization context determined based upon static data and policy before determining whether the client authorization context is to be updated (col. 7, lines 5-22; col. 8, lines 8-17).

Regarding claim 26, Swift discloses for an application in a computer system having a resource manager that manages and controls access to a resource, carrying out a dynamic authorization callback mechanism that provides extensible support for application-defined business rules via a set of APIs and DACLS including a dynamic groups element, which enables an application to assign temporary group membership, based on dynamic factors, to a client for the purpose of checking access rights, wherein said dynamic groups element and a dynamic access element utilize dynamic data that includes run-time data managed by the application (col. 5, lines 2-28;

col. 6, lines 15-27; col. 7, lines 5-22; col. 8, lines 30-60; col. 11, lines 10-56; col. 12, line 60 – col. 13, line 15).

Regarding claim 27, Swift further discloses a dynamic access check element, which enables an application to perform dynamic access checks, via DACLS and APIs, said dynamic access checks being customized to the application (col. 13, lines 20-56).

Regarding claim 28, Swift further discloses that the dynamic groups element and a dynamic access element are performed at the operating system level (col. 13, lines 20-56). Inherently the elements are registered with the operating system which is the resource manager of the computer system.

Allowable Subject Matter

13. Subject to the above 112, 1st paragraph rejections, claims 33-34 would be allowable over the prior art of record.

14. The following is a statement of reasons for the indication of allowable subject matter. Regarding claim 33, the limitation "the application using an initialization routine to register with a resource manager dynamic groups function that enable the application to assign temporary group membership based upon transient or changing factors to a client for the purpose of

checking access rights and to register with said resource manager dynamic access check callback functions that enable the application to perform customized procedures for checking access rights based on said transient or changing factors" in combination with "automatically invoking a dynamic access check callback function by access check application programming interfaces that initialize a client authorization context from a system level authorization context or a user's security identifier, whereby when a user attempts to connect to the application, the registered dynamic access check callback function is invoked such that the client context is augmented with client contextual data dynamically computed using said dynamic data" have not been taught by prior art. The closest prior art, Swift (6,308,274), discloses initializing a client authorization context from a system level authorization context or a user's security identifier and augmenting the client authorization context with client contextual data dynamically computed; however, Swift does not disclose performing those tasks by invoking a registered dynamic access check callback function.

Conclusion

15. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

U.S. Patent No. 7,216,345 to Porter

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Minh Dinh whose telephone number is 571-272-3802. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon-Fri: 10:00am-6:30pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Gilberto Barron can be reached on 571-272-3799. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.


Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Application/Control
Number: 09/849,093
Art Unit: 2132

Page 15

/MD/
Minh Dinh
Examiner
Art Unit 2132

11/19/07



Benjamin E. Lanza
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 2132